



CRM-M-40718-2024 (O&M)

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

215

CRM-M-40718-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 14th January, 2025

Mukeem

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Saksham Khunger, Advocate and
Mr. Sandeep Khunger, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-**CRM-33282-2024**

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 100 dated 23.03.2024 registered under Sections 3/13(1), 8/13(3) of the Haryana Gauvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015 and Sections 353, 186, 201 and 120-B of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Sadar Nuh, District Nuh.

2. As per the allegations, on 23.03.2024 a police party headed by Sub Inspector Bachhu Singh had gone to the village Halock Bai, Mewat on the basis of a secret information and had found the petitioner and others



while slaughtering cows. They had pelted stones towards the police party and then by taking advantage of darkness escaped. Many slaughtered cows, two alive cows and implements used for slaughtering cows were recovered from the spot. The petitioner had been arrested on 22.04.2024. The investigation stands concluded.

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the grounds and it is argued by his counsel that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since long. Trial is likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody. The co-accused Khurshid has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserve to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He may misuse the concession of bail or commit similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. He is involved in several other cases of similar nature. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 22.04.2024. Though some other cases are also alleged to have been registered against him, however, pendency of the same cannot be considered as a ground for denying benefit of bail to the petitioner. Trial is likely to take time. As such, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make



CRM-M-40718-2024 (O&M)

-3-

any comment on the merits of the case, lest the same prejudice the trial, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds of two sureties to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE**

14th January, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*

2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*